



City of Redmond Planning Commission June 8, 2005 Meeting Summary

Planning Commissioners in Attendance:

Kim Allen, Susan Petitpas, Suzanne Querry, Martin Snodgrass, Charlie McCarthy (during second half of meeting)

Planning Commissioners not in Attendance:

Korby Parnell

Staff and Guests in Attendance:

Lori Peckol, Jeff Churchill, Redmond Planning Department

Business Conducted:

Chair Snodgrass called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm. The Commission excused Commissioner Parnell from the meeting, and recognized that Commissioner McCarthy would arrive later. Chair Snodgrass announced that there is a vacancy on the Planning Commission and invited people to apply for the position.

There were no items from the audience, and the Commission approved the meeting agenda.

The first item on the Commission's agenda was approval of Planning Commission reports to City Council. Commissioner Querry moved approval of the report on the proposed Innovative Housing Pilot Program. Commissioner Petitpas seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4 to 0. Commissioner Petitpas moved approval of the report on the proposed Implementation and Community Indicators Program. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4 to 0. On behalf of the Planning Commission, Chair Snodgrass complimented Jeff Churchill on his excellent work during the past year, and read aloud a letter of appreciation signed by the Commissioners.

Chair Snodgrass opened the study session on the proposed content of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Package. Ms. Peckol recapped the City's process for setting the content of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Package, presented an overview of each of the proposed amendments, and noted that at this point, a primary question for the Planning Commission is whether any additional amendments should be included in the proposed package. She noted that regulatory amendments which are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan do not need to be listed in the package.

The Commissioners did not propose any additional amendments. They did ask questions about various proposed amendments, including whether the privately initiated amendments would need to be considered using a quasi-judicial process. The Commission also briefly discussed whether it was appropriate for the Planning Commission to review the proposed financial functional plan. They requested that once work on this amendment is further along, that the lead staff for the amendment consult with the Planning Commission to discuss the initial concepts for this functional plan, including what it would look like, and again consider the Planning Commission's role in review.

The Commission asked that the City's cable channel be used to help provide notice to the community regarding the list of proposed amendments that will be considered. Finally, the Commission asked that staff draft a schedule of when each of the proposed amendments is expected to be ready for Planning Commission consideration. Ms. Peckol responded that she would get back with the Commission on any unanswered items raised during this discussion.

Chair Snodgrass next opened the study session on the proposed scope of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan Implementation and Refinement Project. Lori Peckol presented an overview of the proposed project in preparation for the upcoming joint Planning Commission and City Council on June 29. She described the proposed study area, adopted vision for the area, progress to date in carrying out the plan, reasons the project is a priority, proposed questions to address during the course of the project, and anticipated outcomes.

The Commissioners discussed and provided initial feedback regarding the scope and process for the project. A summary of the discussion follows.

Issues to Explore

1. Talk with developers, property owners and businesses to determine:
 - Is there interest or plans to undertake mixed use or residential development in the Overlake Shopping & Mixed Use Area?
 - What are the obstacles to mixed use and residential development? Are regulations, parking requirements, or cost an issue?
 - What actions would be needed to attract the kind of development envisioned for this area?
2. Seek the perspective of an economic or real estate specialist regarding economic questions, such as how current property values compare to potential values if properties were redeveloped.
3. Talk with developers of Juanita Village regarding what was successful or could be improved with their project.
4. Opportunities to improve transportation connections, particularly for pedestrians, between Redmond and Bellevue? Currently, it is difficult to travel from one commercial area to another.

Public Involvement

1. Important to inform and involve major stakeholders early on in the planning process.
2. The majority of Commissioners agreed with staff that due to the character of the study area (primarily businesses and approximately 500 residences), it makes sense to consider alternatives to formation of a citizen advisory committee for the duration of the project. Staff

commented that it can be difficult for business people to commit to meeting regularly throughout the duration of a one- or two-year project. As a result, one option staff has discussed is forming small groups of stakeholders that meet for a defined duration and provide input on key project issues.

Commissioners stated that there could be tension between the business and residential communities, and commented on the importance of getting residents to participate.

Coordination with Bellevue

1. What are the significant differences between City of Redmond policies and regulations for the Overlake area and City of Bellevue policies and regulations for the Bel-Red area?
2. Invite City of Bellevue staff to talk with the Redmond Planning Commission regarding future alternative visions that the City of Bellevue may evaluate for the Bel-Red area.
3. Consider holding a joint meeting of the Redmond and Bellevue Planning Commissions.

Staff follow-up

1. Provide copy of land use map for Bel-Red Corridor.
2. Provide information regarding expected timing for Nintendo development agreement and anticipated height of buildings to be developed through the Microsoft development agreement.
3. Provide information on the status of transportation projects from the 2004 reconciliation report, plus an update on projects completed and started since then.

There were no reports. The Commissioner briefly reviewed their extended calendar.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.